

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figs. 3 and 5. This sheet, which includes Figs. 3, 4 and 5, replaces the original sheet including Figs. 3, 4 and 5.

- In Fig. 3, elements 19' and 19'' have been identified.
- In Fig. 5, element 2 has been identified.
- No changes have been made to Fig. 4.

Attachment: Replacement Drawing Sheet(s)  
Annotated Drawing Sheet(s) Showing Changes

REMARKS

The Official Action of August 9, 2007, and the prior art cited and relied upon therein have been carefully studied. The claims in the application are now claims 21-32, and these claims define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. Favorable reconsideration and such allowance are respectfully urged.

Claims 1-20 have been canceled in favor of new claims 21-32 which remain in the application for consideration.

In response to the Examiner's objection to claim 1 and rejection of claims 1 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, Applicant has canceled these claims and drafted corresponding claims which eliminate the problems identified by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's objection and rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 have now been overcome.

The Examiner has further rejected claims 1-7 and 9-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lerchner '611 in view of Leuling '669 further in view of Howard '845. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as applied to new claims 21-32.

Applicant submits that none of the three patents identified above teach a cap made as a unit, having an upper and lower slot on edges of the cap communicating with a chamber therein. The security key is engaged to the cap through the slots so as to locate the claimed data storage modules within the chamber of the cap.

In comparison, Lerchner and Howard teach only a single slot formed on the bottom edge of their caps while Leuling appears to teach upper and lower slots 14 (see Fig. 5). However, security key 4 of Leuling is clearly not engaged through these slots as claimed by Applicant.

Further, there is no teaching in the cited prior art of the location of the first data storage module being on the axis of the security key and covered by the cap as set out in claim 21.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention patentably defines over the cited prior art combination on the basis of at least the structural differences identified above, making new claims 21-32 allowable and putting this application in condition for allowance.

The prior art documents made of record and not relied upon have been noted along with the implication that

Appln. No. 10/541,069  
Amdt. dated December 12, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of August 9, 2007

such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently  
pertinent to warrant their applications against any of  
applicant's claims.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance are  
earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By



Norman J. Latker

Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma

Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197

Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528

G:\bn\i\isle\keller17\pto\2007-12-10-Amendment.doc